UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

Alonzo Teal,	§
	§
Plaintiff,	<u> </u>
VS.	§ CIVIL ACTION NO. H-05-3513
	§
Kraft Foods Global, Inc.	§
and	§
Kraft Nabisco,	§
	§
Defendants.	§

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion requesting a court-appointed attorney to represent him in this employment discrimination case. While this Court does have the power to appoint counsel in civil actions, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) (1996), there is no right to court-appointed counsel in a civil rights case. *See Castro Romero v. Becken*, 256 F.3d 349, 353-54 (5th Cir. 2001). "In evaluating whether the appointment of counsel is proper, the district court considers the type and complexity of the case, the litigant's ability to investigate and present the case, and the level of skill required to present the evidence." *Id.* at 354.

In this case, Plaintiff Alonzo Teal complains that Defendants Kraft Foods Global, Inc. and Kraft Nabisco (collectively, "Kraft") discriminated against him on the basis of his race by harassing him and assigning him tasks that did not fall within his job description. Teal's Complaint, supporting documents, and other filings indicate that he is fully capable of articulating his claim and arguments, which are not factually or legally complex. Teal's motion for a court-appointed attorney, Docket No. 6, is therefore **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 8th day of November, 2005.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED at Houston, Texas, on this the 8th day of November, 2005.

KEITH P. ELLISON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Lus P. Ellis

TO INSURE PROPER NOTICE, EACH PARTY WHO RECEIVES THIS ORDER SHALL FORWARD A COPY OF IT TO EVERY OTHER PARTY AND AFFECTED NON-PARTY EVEN THOUGH THEY MAY HAVE BEEN SENT ONE BY THE COURT.